

Appl. No.: 10/715,202  
Amdt. dated 03/20/2006  
Reply to Office action of December 21, 2005

### REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Official Action dated December 21, 2005.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for a timely and thorough review of the above-referenced patent application. Claims 1-22 were previously pending in the application. Claims 1-22 have been rejected. Applicant respectfully traverses each of the rejections set forth in the Official Action.

The Official Action rejected Claims 1, 12-15, 17, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,553,125 to Martensson. The Official Action rejected Claims 2-6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martensson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,845,219 to Henriksson. The Official Action rejected Claims 7-11, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martensson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,084 B1 to Bushnell.

The Martensson patent provides a mobile telephone capable of comparing the telephone number of incoming telephone calls to a speed-dial list, and selectively allowing the calls to ring through based on the presence or absence of the telephone number in the speed-dial list. The decision to allow a call to ring through may also be based on the content of a special instruction field within the speed-dial list. According to the Martensson patent, the incoming calls are compared directly to the speed-dial list. As such, the speed-dial list functions as a call-screening list. Because the Martensson patent discloses the use of the speed-dial list as a call-screening list, the mobile telephone of Martensson would not be capable of screening calls from telephone numbers that are not contained in the speed-dial list. Furthermore, the mobile telephone of Martensson risks mistakenly screening a call from telephone number that is contained in the speed-dial list, but that is not intended or desired to be screened.

In accordance with one aspect of the claimed invention of the present application, as currently recited by independent Claims 1, 15, 21 and 22, a radiotelephonic device is provided that is capable of forming a call-screening list from a previously created speed-dial list. Although the resulting call-screening list may include some of the same telephone numbers as the speed-dial list, because the created call-screening list is separate from the speed-dial list from

Appl. No.: 10/715,202  
Amdt. dated 03/20/2006  
Reply to Office action of December 21, 2005

which it is formed, the claimed device is capable of including additional telephone numbers such that calls from telephone numbers that are not contained in the speed-dial list may be screened. Additionally, a separate call-screening list reduces the possibility of mistakenly screening a call from a telephone number which is contained in the speed-dial list but which is not desired to be screened, since such a telephone number would not be contained in the call-screening list. In contrast to the claimed invention, however, the Martensson, Henriksson and Bushnell patents, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest forming a call-screening list that is separate from a speed-dial list. In this regard, independent claims 1, 15, 21 and 22 have been amended to emphasize that the call-screening list (i.e., the "calling-group listing") is formed separately from the speed-dial list, using telephone numbers that are selected from the speed-dial list. Similarly, dependent claims 10 and 18 have been amended to emphasize that less than the entire speed-dial list can be copied to create the call-screening list.

In view of the remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of independent Claims 1, 15, 21 and 22 is overcome. Since Claims 2-14 depend from independent Claim 1, and Claims 16-20 depend from independent Claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 2-14 and 16-20 is overcome. As such, all of the present claims of the present application are in condition for immediate allowance.


Appl. No.: 10/715,202  
Amdt. dated 03/20/2006  
Reply to Office action of December 21, 2005

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the Claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. Examiner Ekong is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,




Brian J. Teague  
Registration No. 55,670

Customer No. 00826  
ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000  
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

#### CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office at Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on the date shown below.

  
Tamara Stevens

  
Date